



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,851	07/22/2003	Joshua Matthew Lipton		6419
7	590 02/03/2006	/2006 EXAMINER		INER
Joshua Lipton			LUM VANNUCCI, LEE SIN YEE	
2370 W. Rock Island Avenue Flagstaff, AZ 86001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3611	
		DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/623,851	LIPTON, JOSHUA MATTHEW			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Lee Lum	3611			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply secified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 A This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 28-50 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) all is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3611

DETAILED ACTION

1. An Amendment was filed 4/11/05 in which Claims 1-27 were cancelled, and Claims 28-50 were added.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

"[H]inge means disposed in the extendable arm" (emphasis added) cannot be identified, and does not correspond to the related description in the Spec on pp 18-19. *As best understood*, the arm telescopes, and thus does not contain hinges.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

A. Claims 28 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo 5593259 in view of Brenner 4390088.

Re Claims 28, 30 and 31, Kuo discloses a collapsible shipping container comprising Base frame 1 with first and second sides 31.

First and second side panels 20,

Plurality of crossbars 22, 42,

Casters 14.

Application/Control Number: 10/623,851

Art Unit: 3611

The reference does not disclose hinged subpanels, nor a flexible cover, while Brenner shows

Side (and front and rear) panels 19,21,23,25,29,31 (fig 2) comprised of a plurality of hinged subpanels, and may be secured to the base frame via unidentified fasteners/other attachment means,

Flexible and removable cover 1 secured to the side panels, and covers all sides of the container, and

Flexible tensioners 61.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include these features, as shown in Brenner, to provide greater collapsibility to the container, thus decrease increase portability.

Re Claims 32 and 33, the previous references do not specifically disclose the panels as including attachment means for connection with the base frame, but this feature would have been obvious. For example, such means would have included some type of aperture to accept fasteners, or a structural formation at the top and bottom of each panel. Prior art discloses many types of fastening means, and all are functionally equivalent.

B. Claims 29 and 34-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuo in view of Brenner, and in further view of Everett 6182990.

The previous references disclose the elements as provided above, but do not disclose the base frame as a bicycle trailer. Everett shows this configuration including

Bicycle trailer 10, of which the base 63 may serve as the base frame to the collapsible container, and including

Front 70, and rear 80, brackets with means for attachment to the base (frame), and,

Replaceable spoked wheel 15.

Art Unit: 3611

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this arrangement, as shown in Everett, to provide a multi-use container including trailer means to transport goods and/or the collapsed bicycle. This arrangement increases modularity and function at little additional cost.

Kuo further discloses means 16 for mounting a bicycle frame into a fixed position on the base frame. (It is obvious that means 16 may include other and/or additional components for this objective, so to firmly secure the vehicle to the frame)

C. As best understood, Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomaswick et al 4512473 in view of Grigsby Jr 6938557, and Brenner.

As best understood, Thomaswick discloses a collapsible shipping container comprising Base frame including base members 39, with opposite first and second sides (unidentified, inherent),

The frame being collapsible with mounting body (i.e., opposite base 11, and frame 12, members) with extendable arms 13,14,16, and side walls 15.

The reference does not disclose swing arms, while Grigsby shows these collapsible components 30, as broadly and reasonably interpreted. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this arrangement, as shown in Grigsby, to provide increased structural strength for the assembled container, without detraction from maximum collapsibility, thus increasing safe use and transport, and also compactness when collapsed.

The previous references do not disclose the side/side panels as comprising hinged subpanels, while Brenner shows this configuration with hinged panels 19,21,23,25,29,31. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this configuration, as shown in Brenner, to provide further collapsibility, thus increase compactness and easy transportability.

Art Unit: 3611

4. RESPONSE TO REMARKS

Examiner provides new rejections necessitated by amendments, where Kuo in view of Brenner, etc, obviates all recitations.

Page 5

5. Communication with USPTO/Examiner

Any inquiry concerning this communication, or others, should be directed to Ms. Lum at 703 305-0232, M-F, 9-6. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Ms. Lesley Morris is at 703 308-0629. Our fax number is 571 273 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications: private PAIR only, for published applications: private or public PAIR. For more information re PAIR: http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Questions re private PAIR: contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197.

LESLEY D. MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
SUPERVISORY CENTER 3600

Ms. Lee S. Lum Examiner 1/31/06